



Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

VOL. XVI. No. 1

FEBRUARY 6, 1956

\$3.00 per year; 15 cents per copy

Toward A New Emphasis in Asian Policy

SINCE WE ARE now to be engaged in a great national discussion of foreign policy, it may be the right time to press for more careful consideration of factors in the situation which have so far been too much neglected. The two main purposes of our policy are not in question: the prevention of the extension of Communist power and the prevention of a third world war. Nor can we deny the necessity of relying in part on our power to deter the Communists from acts of military aggression. The failure of our country to have adequate military strength would invite blackmailing pressure, if not actual aggression, against the free nations, including neutralist nations. The change of Communist tactics may help us to see more clearly than before the need to emphasize the following factors in our Asian policy.

1. *The non-military aspects of Communist power.* This journal has called attention to these many times and today the success of the Communist leaders in their propaganda in Asia makes it even more obvious that we have thought too much in military terms in dealing with the threat of communism. Communism does rely on the use of force but it prefers to aid conspiracy and revolution within a nation rather than to invade it from outside. It prefers to take advantage of national situations which are prepared by economic and political weakness and confusion rather than to make an external attack upon a country that is reasonably healthy and united. It uses propaganda and conspiracy to soften potential victims long before it considers the direct use of military force and even such direct use of force is most often related to civil war. The Red armies are a powerful weapon in the softening up process even if they never move because their existence intimidates those who are on the fence. As has been said so often lately, Communist power, because it is not primarily military power, can leap over military defenses, can undermine the effectiveness of any defensive pacts which are not based upon a measure of moral, political and social health. Communist power might even leap over the Pacific Ocean and establish itself in a Latin American country that would be more difficult to control than Guatemala. Even the military defeat of Communist armies would not necessarily destroy the Communist idea or halt

the Communist conspiracy; indeed the conditions created by a war on that scale might be the most effective preparation for communism.

If this analysis is in the main true, the best chance that we have to prevent the spread of communism is to help nations to resist the softening up process. The decision of the Administration to ask for an increase of economic aid and for a long term basis for such aid shows that our policy makers are beginning to take these considerations more seriously, and it is most unfortunate that Senator George and other Democrats are opposing this move.

2. *More sensitive awareness of the intangible effects of what we say or do among the Asian peoples.* It is not necessary here to add to the criticisms of the *Life* article about Mr. Dulles, but there is no doubt that statements in that article sound reckless and truculent to most of the world and especially to the people of Asia. One of the most unfortunate revelations in that article is that the Administration was apparently resolved to defend Quemoy and Matsu against the better judgment of almost every other country in the world except Nationalist China. The most serious aspect of the defense of those islands was the probability that such defense would have involved the use of nuclear weapons on the mainland of Asia. Do we not know what such action would mean symbolically to all of Asia? Do we not know that, whatever the military outcome, it would cost us a moral defeat among our allies and in the whole uncommitted world? Probably, it would have terrified Japan and lost for us what confidence there may still be in us in that country. The unilateral use of force on the mainland of China by a white nation would arouse Asian resentments that would give great strength to Communist propaganda, and this anti-colonial resentment would be combined with the moral horror of which the use of nuclear bombs would be the symbol. The strong moral case that we have against communism would be nullified in most of Asia by such a policy. And yet, so many of our leaders seem unaware of this because they know that communism is so evil, and because military action is a familiar method that is easier to grasp than methods which would be adequate to meet the complexities of Communist power.

3. *Emphasis upon the Asian nations which have the will and the moral, political and social resources to retain their freedom, whether or not they ally themselves with us.* Our present policy and our national feelings seem tied especially to Formosa, South Korea, and the free parts of Indo-China. We have commitments in those areas and the defense of them has intrinsic value as a matter of human freedom and it has strategic importance. But how far do we realize that even if we successfully defended every one of those territories, the free world might still lose Asia? It is even more important for the future of Asia and of humanity that India, Japan, Burma, Pakistan, and Indonesia remain free. It is true that we show a great interest in Japan, but we have a very inadequate understanding of the limits of military power in securing it against communism. Probably we have more satisfactory relations with the Philippines than with any other Asian nation.

We should emphasize India and its role not only because it is the largest of the free nations of the world, but also because it has greater moral authority than any other nation of Asia. There is some confusion in her neutralism but it is an international and not an ideological neutralism, for her government deals with internal communism with great resoluteness. The statements of Indian leaders are often as irksome to us, because of their self-righteousness, as the statements of our leaders are to the Indians. But, when all is said, India now has the will and she may prove to have the resources to preserve her freedom even though she does misjudge the external threat of communism. No amount of military power can, of itself, preserve her freedom if one by one Indian states should in the future become vulnerable to Communist penetration. Intangible factors have great influence on Indian opinion, especially our attitudes toward colonialism and our posture with reference to nuclear war. We need to help India with various kinds of economic aid and technical assistance, but still more we need to understand her resentments and her aspirations and respect her kind of greatness. J.C.B.

EDITORIAL NOTES

We have always had some questions about the creativity of the Protestant Christian faith in relation to the arts. These questions were accentuated by a television program under the auspices of the National Council of Churches given on New Year's day. The general title of the program was "Look Up and Live." The title of this particular program was "Theology of the Dance." Our first question was, why "theology"? Theology is presumably the science about God. Could not the program have been entitled less pretentiously "A Religious Appreciation of the Dance"? But this

anticipatory criticism paled into insignificance as the program developed. It featured a perfectly sincere and competent ballerina who explained the techniques of the art of ballet dancing and then presented the classical dance "Swan Lake."

Both the explanations and the dancing were charming but left the question why the program was presented under the auspices of the National Council, and why it was titled "Theology of the Dance." That question was answered by the subsequent reflections of the representative of the Council who deposed somewhat after this fashion: Our ballerina has told us that the traditions of the dance were handed down from generation to generation by words of mouth and discipline. The truths of Christianity were handed down in the same way. But this is only one analogy between theology and ballet. The lovely dance which we have just witnessed symbolized beauty to us and it reminds us to Jesus who symbolizes truth, beauty and goodness to us. Isn't it wonderful?

We were ashamed that such a program, with such bad theology and such minimal appreciation of the world of the arts, with such banalities and clichés should have been presented under the auspices of the great National Council of Churches. But when we reflected we came to the conclusion that such a program was possible only because of the low estate of the relation of Protestantism and the arts. Only in an atmosphere of ignorance could any one conceive of just this minimal appreciation of art by "theology," which neither edified nor instructed either believer or unbeliever.

On a much higher level was another television interview on the same day of America's most renowned theologian, Professor Tillich of Harvard University. Tillich talked profoundly, as he always does, upon many subjects, but coming to the question of religious art he gave it as his opinion that the masterpiece "Guernica" by Picasso was the most "Protestant of modern works of art." Picasso is a well known fellow-traveler who certainly did not intend to produce a Protestant work of art, but that would not exclude the possibility of his doing so inadvertently. Yet the only "Protestant" feature of Picasso's picture is that it views the world at sixes and sevens or, in short, as disjointed and tragic. That might possibly be called "Protestant" in diagnostic terms purely. But if the Christian faith in its Protestant version has any vitality it must go from diagnosis to cure, and there must be some message of redemption to this torn world, or some way of bearing the tragedy of contemporary history which Picasso did not indicate. Thus the noted theologian left us almost as unsatisfied as the banal interpreter of the ballet. This is merely the reaction of an ignoramus to

the present situation, of one who has no answer to the questions raised. The only suggestion we can offer is not a very "creative" one. It is that if we have no more to say about Christianity and the arts than now seems apparent we had better keep silent.

Every effort to encourage the appreciation of the arts on the part of the Church must be welcomed, even though many of these efforts probably suffer from pressure to become immediately relevant to the mass communication media, to radio and television. If we are suffering from serious deficiencies in the realm of the arts, as seems likely, the weakness will not be corrected by any television program. Television, or any of the communication media, can not correct the fault, for instance, that there is only one authentic form of Protestant architecture in America: the New England meeting house. Other Protestant styles are either adaptations of the medieval gothic, either cre-

ative or archaic, or they represent a mixture of styles which someone has defined as "early Patagonian." In literature the efforts of Protestant artists are usually too self-conscious or sentimental. The two greatest poets of our day, T. S. Eliot and W. H. Auden, are explicitly Christian. It may, however, be significant that they are more Catholic than Protestant, though the occasional rumors of Eliot's journey to Rome are false. They emanate from people who do not know the significance of the term "Anglo-Catholic."

All this presents no solution but merely describes a dilemma which we ought to modestly recognize as a fact. If it is a fact, the weakness is a serious one, which can be corrected only by the labors of the artistic spirits and the real artists in the Church, each one laboring in his own sphere of competence and interest.

R. N.

The Challenge of Colonialism and Racism

GEORGE W. SHEPHERD, JR.

FRANCE AND SOUTH AFRICA walked out the Tenth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations because they could not face fairly and squarely the fact that the period of the white man's rule over other races is ending. In the new burst of idealism which followed the end of the last Great War, we created the United Nations as an organization for all the world's people seeking equality as a new basis for peace. And now the most heated issues of the debates of the United Nations are white supremacy and colonialism, with the Western nations bitterly resenting most of the pleas of the ex-colonial nations in Asia and Africa. Even the cold war has not produced such tensions within the world organization as these issues are producing today.

The rigid structure of colonialism, which has existed for nearly a century in much of Africa, is cracking under the strains of the subterranean revolutionary forces which are gathering and erupting in places like Algeria and Kenya. South African repression of her African peoples is hardening rather than softening. These are issues with which a world organization must deal if it is to preserve the peace and be anything but a facade for Western politics. The United States and other Western powers make a great mistake by declaring problems like those in Algeria and South Africa questions of "domestic jurisdiction." This leaves the field to the Communist bloc to play the role of the lone champion of exploited dependent peoples.

I.

Many Protestants in America are beginning to realize the importance of our decisions on these issues. As members of an ecumenical movement that has taken a clear stand against colonialism and white supremacy,

we see the hypocrisy of silence. Also, as citizens of America, we possess the means and power, if we were willing to use them, to do a great deal to insure peaceful, evolutionary progress of dark-skinned human beings.

Since the days of the first missionaries to Africa, the greatest force for social justice on that continent has been Christianity. As Chester Bowles said after a recent trip to Africa, "If any of us is tempted to feel that the African's demand for social justice is premature, let us remember that in the last 300 years, the most politically explosive force in Africa has been the Bible and so far the impact of Karl Marx's *Das Kapital* has been almost nil." The early missionaries abolished the slave trade and spread education the length and breadth of the land. If it had not been for these courageous souls—many less famous than Livingstone and Schweitzer—who, with their Christian love, have helped to ameliorate and atone for the worst evils of the white man's colonialism, there would have been little good at all in this harsh system. Largely because of the objectives of these missionaries who healed, taught, and gave new dignity to the African, colonialism was softened. And because many of the ideas of the missionaries are now incorporated into colonial development programs, colonialism has become not simply a device of great evil but also a potential for great good as the means of transition from primitive societies into developed civilizations. Thus the Christian Church today remains the greatest single hope for enlightenment and progress in Africa.

Yet Africa stands today on the threshold of a new era. The traditional missionary pattern is inadequate for the new needs of her people. There is a danger that we Western Christians will not fully see this in

time. Suddenly there is a great demand for social justice in Africa far beyond anything we have seen before. With very few exceptions, Christian missions and churches are not meeting adequately the needs of the changed situation. Africans want freedom from colonial subjugation and exploitation. They want to remove their poverty and abolish the racial discrimination that corrodes their life.

Christians have started the revolution in Africa but there is grave danger that we may not be allowed to complete it. Too often the type of Christianity which is taught by Western missionaries is irrelevant to the tremendous social changes that are taking place. Africans do not want to postpone to the "afterlife" a heavenly reality in which "all God's chillun got shoes." This writer spent two years in a British Protectorate where there was a tremendous demand among the African people for farmer's cooperatives and improved agriculture. None of the mission programs there—Protestant or Catholic—were in any sense related to this need. Missions should take to heart the words of John R. Mott: "If you cannot do more, you have already done too much."

It is not enough in Africa today to teach children to read and write without relating this development to a universal compulsory educational system which the African needs and wants and can only be provided through government programs. It is not enough to preach about the immorality of polygamy to Africans while remaining silent on the greed of white settlers who have acquired the best land for themselves and pushed Africans into completely inadequate reservations as in Kenya, Southern Rhodesia, and South Africa. Any system which destroys human dignity and negates the law of love should be equally condemned. This should remind us of the statement in *Re-Thinking Missions*: "Men are to be saved, not for the next world alone, and not out of human life, but within human life."

Racialism in South Africa

There is probably no greater challenge to Christianity in the world today than the charge of the Communists that Christians are hypocritical about their belief in racial equality. Americans, particularly, should approach this problem in humility because of our great discrimination against the Negro in this country. Yet in Africa this problem is dramatically approaching a crisis which can destroy overnight much of the good work which Christians have so painfully constructed through the centuries.

The racialism of the present South African government is all the more appalling as it professes to be based on Christian beliefs. Nothing is more damaging to the Christian cause in Africa than this apostasy.

A large section of the Christian Church, organized in the Christian Council of South Africa, is opposed to 'apartheid.' However, the Africans and coloreds, who form 80% of the population of South Africa, are won-

dering how much this opposition to apartheid among the main denominations goes beyond theory in the light of the current surrender of Protestantism to the Bantu Education Act. This Act has deprived the missions of their schools and is widely regarded by such men as Bishop Reeves of Johannesburg as another step in the creation of a system which will keep the black man the servant of the white man in perpetuity.

It should be noted that several courageous Protestant leaders, such as the Anglican Bishop Reeves and Father Huddleston, publicly condemned the Bantu Education Act and took steps to insure the continuance of schools under their jurisdiction. Also, two Congregational colleges have attempted to remain independent, but this independence has received little support from world-wide Protestantism, and it is not likely to last long. Father Huddleston, for some reason best known to his superiors, has now been recalled to England by his mission. The Catholics have won a great march on Protestants by raising over \$2,000,000 to keep their schools in South Africa from being taken away from them. There is something very weak in our (Protestant) response to the crisis in South Africa. Strong Protestant churches in America and England should have come to the aid of the South African churches but they did not. Is this another sign of Western decadence, like our resignation to Mussolini's rape of Ethiopia?

It should be noted that there is an increasing gulf opening between the Christian Churches and missions and the African political leaders in the South African National Congress. Under these circumstances, communism stemming largely from Indian sources, is an ever-increasing influence. I am reminded of the view of Dr. John Bennett that communism, despite the fact that it is terribly wrong, can be regarded as a "judgment of God" upon the weakness of Christians who fail to live up to the law of love they profess. Certainly it will be a false god that will triumph in South Africa unless, with the help of the one true God, Christians can rally their forces for the battle of Armageddon that confronts them there.

Racialism in Kenya

In other parts of Africa Christians are presented with the same challenge of racialism. In Kenya the Mau Mau is a revolt of a discontented and frustrated African peasantry against a long-standing system of white supremacy. The fact that the Mau Mau has resorted to brutal tribal rituals and killed many more fellow Africans than white must not be allowed to hide the fact that the white man has created an intolerable system in Kenya.

The best land has been appropriated for about 30,000 white settlers and the 5,000,000 African peasants have been pushed into inadequate reserves in which they can either starve or revolt. They have been virtually pressed into service on the white plantations by the system of taxation and inadequate land, as Norman

Leys pointed out twenty-five years ago. This forced labor system is comparable to the recruitment of labor in South Africa and has been condemned by the International Labor Organization and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

The peaceful political aspirations of the people have for many years been frustrated by the extremist settler group. And the color bar has disfigured almost all levels of human relationships in churches, hotels, trains, civil service, as well as land ownership.

The despicable terrorism of the Mau Mau is uncondonable; yet there is a white Mau Mau which, like the Ku Klux Klan a few years ago in this country, has been resorting to terror, whipping, and killing in reprisal. A recent book, *Cape to Cairo*, by a British Quaker, Reginald Reynolds, contains a revealing account of the "white Mau Mau."

What is the role of the Church in a situation like this? Churches and missions, relatively silent on the underlying issues of injustice, have launched a campaign to rally African Christians against the Mau Mau. Moral Rearmament teams have been given rehabilitation assignments behind the barbed wire enclosures that contain over 40,000 Kikuyu. It need hardly be said that the Moral Rearmament Group offers no social justice. There is a tragic silence over the white counter-terrorism, which is just as dire an indication as the African terrorism of the depths to which man can sink in self-righteousness and pride.

The color question has replaced the colonial question as the number one issue in Africa. As a student at Makerere College in Uganda explained to this writer when we were discussing the case of Jomo Kenyatta, "Africans are not concerned about whether Kenyatta was guilty or not. The issue has become one of black against white." Can Christians go on much longer in Africa allowing issues to degenerate to this level? Christians of all races in Africa, but most of all white Christians, face the problem that the class conflict is becoming internationalized in terms of race. White Christians, like capitalists, because they are in the dominant, powerful position, must face frankly the equalitarian demands of the Christian ethic toward which we are compelled to strive.

II.

It is not only in Africa, working as Father Huddleston and others have done, that Christians have opportunity and responsibility. We can also work through our national and ecumenical agencies and through our political organizations for a transformation of the present policies of Western powers.

At the Evanston Conference of the World Council of Churches, a significant and far-sighted statement was adopted which can form the basis of Christian political action on colonialism. It was stated that "The legitimate right of the self-determination of peoples must be recognized. Specific assurance of independence

or self-government should be given and administering authorities should take reasonable risks in speeding progress toward this goal." Very strong statements were also adopted proclaiming the equality of all children of God, and all the various forms of discrimination by one race against another were condemned.

The United States and the United Nations

Our American political leaders of both parties, with one or two exceptions, have yet to realize the tremendous opportunity that the United States now has within the United Nations to become the true champion of the rights of dependent people around the world by mediating the present irreconcilable positions between the colonial powers and the ex-colonial powers. At present, our policies in the United Nations on self-government and racial equality only intensify the internationalization of the class conflict on a racial basis. As the wealthy leader of the Western bloc we have consistently thrown our weight behind the status quo policies of the European colonial powers. This has become vividly clear in the current session of the General Assembly on the Algerian and South African questions.

The United States delegates voted against the inclusion of the Algerian question on the agenda and helped defeat the continuation of the Commission on the Racial Situation in the Union of South Africa which, for three years, had been making a very valuable study of apartheid in South Africa.

At present United States policy on African questions is not determined by any particular regard for principles of human freedom and equality but is derived primarily from strategic considerations. Our air bases in French Morocco and our alliance with France in the North Atlantic Treaty have been the decisive factors determining our North African policy. The association of South Africa in the defensive alliance of free nations against the Communist bloc and her wealth of uranium and other valuable minerals are the decisive factors which shape our policy in sympathy with the South African Union, regardless of her internal policies. As Professor Hans Morgenthau of the University of Chicago has expressed it, the United States believes that it cannot pursue "policies in Africa which would jeopardize the position of, and its relations with, its allies in Western Europe. . . it has subordinated its long-range interests in the autonomous development of the native population to short-range considerations of strategy and expediency." The painful fact is that we have no colonial policy other than this one of expediency. Ours is the billion dollar wind that holds the colonial kite aloft. A Christian response to this Machiavellian policy should be, "How long, Oh, Lord?"

It is not proposed here that the United States should seek within the United Nations and elsewhere to become, on the other hand, simply the hatchet man for

the ex-colonial powers of Asia and Africa to hack down hastily the crumbling bulwarks of the status quo. There are some voices in this country which fall into this error out of their exaggerated sympathy with colonial and emergent peoples of Asia and Africa. To some extent we have to recognize the existence of special area interests in our world and try to work out a just peaceful compromise between them. By attempting to leap over these hard realities we will fall flat on our faces. Mr. Nehru is often more right than Mr. Churchill, but not always.

Because the United States is not economically tied into an empire, and because of our historical sympathy with colonial peoples, and because a head-on conflict with the Soviet Union is not as imminent as it appeared to be a few years ago, we are at a point where a radical change in our policy conceivably could be initiated. This policy should be one of acting as the mediating power of justice between the conflicting claims of the European colonial powers versus the ex-colonial and colonial peoples. In Christian terms, this would be the introduction of the law of love in its transcendent respect for the dignity of each man, regardless of race, creed, or culture, into the world situation of conflicting self-interests. To suppose that we Americans are entirely free of self-interest would be fatal but at least in this particular situation we are in a position to take a more objective view than the primary antagonists. Representatives of both the colonial and ex-colonial powers have made it clear that if it comes to a choice between their national interests and remaining in the United Nations they will be forced to leave the world organization. Perhaps it is, after all, a symbolic twist of history that has placed the United Nations headquarters in New York.

In practical terms this Christian approach would mean that we would not vote with the colonial powers to exclude explosive issues like Algeria or apartheid in South Africa from the United Nations agenda. We would welcome discussion and investigation and attempt to bring the irreconcilable positions into a tolerable compromise. We would exercise our great power as much to restrain France and South Africa from fruitless walk-outs as to convince the Asia-Africa group that they must be fair in their criticisms and patient with the process of dissolution of empire. Our role in the Trusteeship Council in which we have a decisive vote between the Administering and non-Administering powers, presents an excellent opportunity to break many existing deadlocks, such as the one over the proposal for establishing "target schedules" for self-government of United Nations Trust Territories. Such a policy might incidentally force the Communist bloc to play a more responsible role on these issues, though this is doubtful.

This is a thin and narrow pathway to tread and it would be easy to fall into the error of compromise when a forthright stand for social justice is required.

Yet it presents an outstanding opportunity for Christians and others to work through all the various channels and agencies at their command to further the cause, not only of dependent and downtrodden people, but also to hold together the United Nations, our last best hope of peace.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors:

I have never felt an urge to get a brother minister prosecuted on a heresy charge. But when it comes to Dr. Niebuhr's references to Christology in his article, "The Heresy Trials," in your issue of December 26, I find myself disagreeing with him as heartily as I have agreed with his social and political views.

To Dr. Niebuhr the one intellectually valid Christian faith is faith in "the Christ event." By "the Christ event" he seems to mean the apostolic faith stripped of its miraculous elements — the "pre-scientific myths which can only be believed by those not sufficiently cultured to understand the world that modern science has unfolded."

Now, C. S. Lewis is not in favor with the select circle that takes "the Christ event" line, but I venture to think that his *Miracles* leaves the theological liberals' *a priori* rejection of the miraculous no leg to stand on. When Dr. Niebuhr echoes liberal dogmatism at this point, he writes off a scholar like Maritain as "not sufficiently cultured"; also, two ecumenical Commissions — Faith and Order, and Life and Work—which, in their pre-Amsterdam conference, unanimously declared that the World Council of Churches must be based uncompromisingly on "the Nicene faith."

"The Christ event" theologians appear to be neo-Ritschlians. In Ritschlian theology only "value-judgments," springing from "fundamental self-feeling," are valid. Ritschl dismissed so cardinal a New Testament concern as the "Eternity of the Son" as fruitlessly metaphysical. He maintained that the values of Christianity can be held without accepting their ideological orientation. The article on Ritschlianism in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* regards it as a "form of agnosticism" and thinks its "faith-knowledge" is "wrenched from its bearings and suspended in mid-ocean." A generation ago the Ritschlian's value-judgments led him to substitute a very naive theological liberalism for evangelical doctrine. Today the neo-Ritschlian has a more realistic set of values which he supposes can be had, though their supernatural-miraculous New Testament setting and certification are scrapped.

For example, Dr. Niebuhr speaks of "the central fact that the Christian Church was founded upon the experience of the resurrection" and, in the same breath, indicates his disbelief that Christ achieved a bodily resurrection. However, the unambivalent word, resurrection, does not lend itself to Dr. Niebuhr's polemical purpose. Precisely what resurrection means is a *bodily* survival of death. Moreover, in rejecting the possibility of bodily resurrection, Niebuhr must align himself against Paul. For Paul warned "some" of the Corinthians: "If Christ has not been raised, then our preaching is in vain and your faith is in vain."

A generation ago a basic breach with Paul would not have embarrassed the Ritschlians because theological liberals then blamed Paul for perverting the Christianity of Christ. However, "tragic world events" since then have impelled the Neo-Ritschlians to go Pauline, at least ostensibly, since Paul's expositions of the dimensions of sin and grace are indispensable to those who are disillusioned as to man's capacity to perfect himself.

Thus Niebuhr, wanting Paul on his side, claims that Paul never validated "the Lordship of Christ and the power of his saving grace by . . . his bodily resurrection." Of course, I Corinthians 15: 1-19 is absolute evidence to the contrary, as is a phrase in the prologue to Romans, "designated Son of God in power . . . by his resurrection from the dead." Niebuhr adds that Paul "equated his experience of the resurrected Lord with those of the immediate disciples, though he was obviously not among those who saw the 'empty tomb.' This implies, in the context, that Paul deemed the fact that 'the immediate disciples' saw the empty tomb superfluous. Nothing could be further from the truth. The information he 'received' from others — clearly those 'immediate disciples' — Paul rated 'of first importance.' (I Corinthians 15:3) It is from the standpoint of spiritual dynamic that he equated his own experience of the ascended Christ with their experience of the risen Christ, not from the standpoint of evidential value.

That one of the greatest of living theologians can be involved in ambiguities so palpable betrays the radical deficiency of the whole "Christ event" approach. If you believe that the Divine Word — God in his outgoing (immanent?) aspect — emptied himself of his heavenly glory to share man's tragic lot, then you can embrace love to the uttermost as a principle validated by the universe; if not, you would not be illogical to dismiss it as an irrelevancy that is utopian in a hard and brutal world. If you believe that God "made him to be sin who knew no sin so that in him we might become the righteousness of God," then justification can mean to you what it meant to Paul and Luther; if not, not. Similarly with the resurrection and the sublime Event to which the New Testament looks forward, "when [Christ] delivers the Kingdom to God the Father . . ."

To imagine that these ineffable and transcendent values can be preserved without diminution of their appeal and vitality when the flower is sundered from the root is to cease to believe in the law of cause and effect. The issue is not, as Dr. Niebuhr asserts, whether "belief in miracles is the only criterion of faith," which no one has ever claimed it is. The issue is whether the faith itself, involving as it does the Incarnation, the atoning death, the resurrection, and so on, can be dissociated from the miraculous and retain its dynamism.

Rev. M. V. Oggel
Glen Rock, N. J.

We are sorry that Dr. Oggel, an old friend of Christianity and Crisis, was so long under a misapprehension about the theological orientation of the journal because we countered the moralistic and utopian errors of "liberal" protestantism. We were under the impression, however, that we had made it clear that we were grateful for the critical freedom which was intro-

duced by modern scholarship, especially in dealing with historic documents.

If we avail ourselves of this freedom we will soon recognize that St. Paul did not believe in a "physical resurrection." He declared about the resurrection that "it is sown a natural body and is raised a spiritual body." In regard to the resurrection of Christ the same Paul equated his experience of the resurrected Lord belatedly "as a child untimely born" with the experience of the first disciples, thereby revealing how little stock he put in a "physical resurrection." The idea arose after Paul's time, but the fact that he did not know of the doctrine of a physical resurrection proves that the idea is not necessary to affirm, as he affirmed, that "if in this life only we had hoped in Christ we are of all men most miserable." The Christian faith insists, in short, that the meaning of our existence transcends the bounds of our physical life and the bounds of nature-history. That is a substantive article of faith. The belief in a physical resurrection is meant as a support, but can actually become a detriment, to this affirmation.

R. N.

To the Editors:

The Rev. Charles L. McGavern takes issue in your correspondence columns (January 23, 1956) with St. Hereticus' recent (November 28, 1955) indictment of the current, essentially dishonest, ecclesiastical use of fake gothic architecture. Mr. McGavern wonders whether "St. Hereticus thinks that clergy ought to be modern and up-to-date and, therefore, make their pastoral calls only in two-toned automobiles."

This is emphatically not the point! To make the analogy accurate, St. Hereticus' point was that if it is only sensible for present-day clergymen to make their calls in automobiles, then it would be ludicrous for a minister to affix a stuffed horse head to the grille of his car, fasten horseshoes to the tire treads, drape saddlebags over the hood, and shout "giddap" every time he steps on the starter.

Surely one need not become "frightened of the past" or lose respect for the circuit riders to believe there would be something very wrong about conveying the impression that horses are the only legitimate means of ministerial transportation, and that, therefore, we must all conspire to convince the public that our automobiles are fueled with hay.

Arnold W. Hearn
New York, N. Y.

CHURCH NEWS AND NOTES

Warns Against Treating Non-Catholics As "Wayward Rebels"

NEW YORK (RNS) — Archbishop Richard J. Cushing of Boston, in a sermon here, admonished Roman Catholics against treating non-Catholics as "wayward rebels who have deliberately rejected Christ's teachings."

The archbishop preached at services in St. Patrick's Cathedral marking the opening of the Chair of Unity Octave, the annual week-long period during which Catholics throughout the world pray for the reunion of Christendom. His topic was "The Return of the

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR and JOHN C. BENNETT

Co-Chairmen

M. SEARLE BATES	F. ERNEST JOHNSON
WALDO BEACH	JOSEPH SITTLER, JR.
ROBERT MCAFEE BROWN	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
AMOS N. WILDER	

WAYNE H. COWAN, *Secretary*

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER	WILLIAM MAY
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	JOHN A. MACKAY
J. OSCAR LEE	FRANCIS P. MILLER
UMPHREY LEE	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	ROGER L. SHINN
KENNETH W. THOMPSON	

'Other Sheep' to the Fold of St. Peter, the One Shepherd."

Rather than being intolerant, he said, Catholics "should approach the 'other sheep' in a spirit of love for the truth of God's revelation regarding His Church; in a spirit of tolerance born of love of the truth and nurtured in supernatural charity; and in a spirit of zeal for the triumph of truth over the disintegrating influences of hatred and dissension."

Archbishop Cushing stressed that "we cannot meet the problem of the 'other sheep' in the modern world with the unbending severity which was appropriate in the 13th century." At that time, he said, "infidelity and heresy were largely the result of personal malice and not the consequences, as they are today, of family education and deep-seated misunderstanding and prejudice."

"We must act," he continued, "on the assumption that their heart is right and their intentions honest, unless we have proof positive to the contrary. We must not jump to the conclusion that their attitude toward the Church is hostile when we find that their attitude toward us Catholics is tinged with misgiving and suspicion."

"If we cannot associate with them in their religious worship, we must not create the impression that we are unwilling to live with them in relations of friendship and goodwill as members of the same community. If we cannot cooperate with them in the promotion of their sectarian purposes, we must not refuse to work with them shoulder to shoulder in the advancement of

every project from which we can derive legitimate common benefit.

"If we must hold fast to principles of morality in public and private life which they are unwilling to accept, we must not present to them applications of these principles in ways which will be offensive or suggestive of bigoted intolerance."

Archbishop Cushing said that Americans "have become accustomed in modern times to a plurality of churches," and among non-Catholics diversity of belief is regarded as "the normal and acceptable consequence of individual human differences. In other words," he observed, "we have fallen a little too deeply into the attitude that religious convictions and loyalties upon which they rest are of secondary importance; that our principal concern should be to promote unity and goodwill among all men; that in an atmosphere of social harmony religious questions will somehow settle themselves."

"No one likes to describe this olive-branch form of brotherhood as religious indifferentism. Yet if we are honest with ourselves we must admit that it is but a short step from being indifferent toward the plurality of religions to being indifferent toward the principles themselves upon which religious beliefs are based."

The Boston prelate said Catholics love their Church "principally because we love God, Who sent Christ Our Lord to found it, and because we love Christ Who delivered Himself to His Passion and Death to sanctify it."

"We yearn ardently for the return of the 'other sheep' to the fold," he stated, "but we cannot point out to them any other pathway than that which is paved with the hard rocks of God's changeless Being and illuminated by the penetrating rays of God's revelation of His Will." He said Catholics "cannot water down the content of the dogmas of the faith to meet the demands of an over-critical and self-indulgent intelligentsia." Nor, he said, may Catholics present the Church "merely as a haven of refuge for non-Catholics who are disagreed among themselves on the interpretation of God's revelation and are dissatisfied with the programs of contemporaneous non-Catholics sects."

Instead, Archbishop Cushing asserted, Catholics must "hold fast to the fundamental principle that the medieval mind grasped with such clarity and firmness; that God founded through Christ a Church to which all men are bound to belong. Seven centuries of rationalism and atheistic humanism," he said, "have not changed the revelation made by God to our forebears that His Church has been established on Peter the Rock, that Christ, Who came to this earth to be Mediator between God and man, has endowed the Church with spiritual vitality in His grace, and that the gates of hell, which open threateningly to all who despise the truth, will never prevail against the Church."

Author in this Issue

Following graduate studies at the London School of Economics, George W. Shepherd, Jr. worked for two years in Africa with the Federation of Uganda African Farmers. His experiences are recounted in his recently published book, *They Wait in Darkness*. Until recently the Executive Secretary of the American Committee on Africa, he is a Congregational minister in Flushing, N.Y.

Detroit Public Library
Book Receiving Dept.
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit 2, Mich.

27462 11-56